## REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending.

### Statement of the Substance of the Interview: November 14, 2008

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.133(b), the Applicants request that the following statement of the substance of the interview conducted on November 14, 2008 be made of record. In that telephonic interview, Examiner Ives Wu and Supervisory Patent Examiner Duane Smith discussed claims 1, 8, and 9 with Applicants' representative Eric Ramberg. The Applicants thank the Examiners for their time and courtesy.

With respect to claim 1, agreement was reached that *Seeley* does not teach a manifold.

With respect to claim 8, agreement was not reached with respect to whether or not *Skibowski* is analogous art.

With respect to claim 9, agreement was reached that *Kennedy* had been previously discussed in the context of earlier office actions, and the parties had previously agreed that *Kennedy* is not analogous art (*e.g.*, per the *Examiner Interview Summary* mailed on October 11, 2007).

### Claim Rejections

Claims 1-7, 15, 18-24, and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over U.S. patent number 4,986,838 (herein: *Johnsgard*) in view of U.S. patent number 6,530,977 (herein: *Seeley*).

Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over U.S. patent number 4,986,838 (herein: *Johnsgard*) in view of U.S. patent number 6,530,977 (herein: *Seeley*), in further view of U.S. patent number 6,331,281 (herein: *Teru*).

Claims 8, 10-14, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over U.S. patent number 4,986,838 (herein: *Johnsgard*) in view of U.S. patent number 6,530,977 (herein: *Seeley*), in further view of U.S. patent number 2,608,695 (herein: *Skibowski*).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over U.S. patent number 4,986,838 (herein: *Johnsgard*) in view of U.S. patent number 6,530,977 (herein: *Seeley*), in further view of U.S. patent number 2,608,695 (herein: *Skibowski*) and in further view of U.S. patent number 5,927,957 (herein: *Kennedy*).

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-19**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over *Johnsgard* in view of *Seeley*. Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A scrubber inlet device comprising:
    an inlet manifold including
        a port configured to receive an effluent gas stream from an exhaust line and,
        a heated gas inlet configured to receive a stream of heated gas; and
    a scrubber interface device in fluid communication with the inlet manifold and configured to deliver the effluent gas stream from the inlet manifold to a gas scrubbing system.

The Applicants respectfully traverse, and maintain that the cited references do not teach or describe a scrubber inlet device as recited in the instant application.

The scrubber inlet device of the instant application includes a manifold that receives both an effluent gas stream and a stream of heated gas.

FIG. 1 of *Seeley* illustrates a container (1) including a top portion (6), which includes an apertured plate (13). Gases enter the wet "scrubbing chamber" region of container (1) via apertures in plate (13).

A first region of plate (13) separates the wet "scrubbing chamber" portion of container (1) from the "heated" gas provided by inlets (8). The "heated" gas enters the wet "scrubbing chamber" portion of container (1) via apertures in this first region. In FIG. 1 of *Seeley*, the entry of the "heated" gas is shown near the edge of container (1), ostensibly adjacent to the sleeve (11) that creates the surface of the scrubbing chamber.

The "exhaust gas" of *Seeley* enters the wet "scrubbing chamber" portion of container (1) via apertures in plate (13) that are disposed in a second region of plate (13) that separates inlets (7) from the wet "scrubbing chamber."

In *Seeley*, the exhaust gas enters the "scrubbing chamber" independently of the "heated" gas. As shown in FIG. 1, the two gas streams are separated until they have entered the wet (via spray 15) environment of container (1). No portion of container (1) is a manifold.

As such, the Applicants submit that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach a manifold as recited in the instant application, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejection of claim 1 is overcome, and that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-19 and 27 depend from claim 1; inasmuch as claim 1 is allowable, the Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-19 and 27 are also allowable.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 20-25**

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over *Johnsgard* in view of U.S. *Seeley*. Claim 20 reads as follows:

> 20. (original) A method for delivering an effluent gas stream into a gas scrubbing system comprising:
>
> receiving the effluent gas stream into a manifold;
>
> heating interior surfaces of the manifold to near a condensation temperature of the effluent gas; and
>
> providing the effluent gas stream to an interface device that is
>
> effective to suppress nucleation of condensation from the effluent gas stream, and
>
> configured to direct the effluent gas stream into the gas scrubbing system.

Claim 20 recites a manifold. As discussed with respect to claim 1, neither *Johnsgard* nor *Seeley*, alone or in combination, teaches a manifold. As such, the Applicants maintain that the rejection of claim 20 is overcome, and that claim 20 is now allowable. Claims 21-25 depend from claim 20. Inasmuch as claim 20 is allowable, dependent claims 21-25 are now allowable.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claim 26**

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over *Johnsgard* in view of U.S. *Seeley*. Claim 26 reads as follows:

26. (original) A scrubber inlet device comprising:
an inlet manifold including
a port configured to receive an effluent gas stream from an exhaust line at a first temperature and,
means for maintaining the effluent gas stream at or near the first temperature; and
a scrubber interface device in fluid communication with the inlet manifold and configured to deliver the effluent gas stream from the inlet manifold to a gas scrubbing system.

Claim 26 recites a manifold. As discussed with respect to claim 1, neither *Johnsgard* nor *Seeley*, alone or in combination, teaches a manifold. As such, the Applicants maintain that the rejection of claim 26 is overcome, and that claim 26 is now allowable.

## Conclusion

The Applicants thank the Examiners for their time and courtesy with respect to the telephonic interview of November 14, 2008.

The Applicants thank the Examiners for indication of allowability of claims 1-27, and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Johnsgard et al.

Date: November 21, 2008

By: /CERamberg/
C, Eric Ramberg, Reg. No. 55,562
Carr & Ferrell *LLP*
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
TEL: (650) 812-3465
FAX: (650) 812-3444